

SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR
FOR THE
KENNEDY ENVIRONMENTAL AND MEDICAL CONTRACT
AT THE
JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER

INTRODUCTION

On August 18, 2015, as the designated Source Selection Authority (SSA) for the Kennedy Environmental and Medical Contract (KEMCON), I met with senior officials of the John F. Kennedy Space Center (KSC) and the appointed Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to independently review their evaluation of the Integrated Mission Support Services (IMSS) Final Proposal Revision (FPR). Relevant portions of the SEB's evaluation of IMSS' FPR, and my decision on the selection of IMSS are set forth in this Source Selection Statement.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The objective of this procurement is to acquire a broad range of medical and environmental support services for KSC and the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station (CCAFS). These services include: Environmental Health Services; Environmental Services; and Medical Services.

BACKGROUND

On April 2, 2014, the development of the KEMCON Request for Proposal (RFP) commenced with the appointment of a Procurement Development Team (PDT). The NAICS code for the KEMCON was established as 541620, Environmental Consulting Services, with a corresponding revenue size standard of \$15M annually. Consequently, a Sources Sought Synopsis was issued seeking potential sources for the performance of KEMCON. This Sources Sought Synopsis defined the scope of the KEMCON acquisition and sought information from capable sources to determine industry interest and capability, and to facilitate consideration of small business set aside potential. Based on the capability packages received, the Contracting Officer, with concurrence of the Small Business Specialist and KEMCON PDT Chairperson, determined that an adequate number of capable small business concerns existed to justify the acquisition be set aside for small business. The PDT prepared an acquisition plan, developed a KEMCON website, provided a site tour, scheduled one-on-ones with companies and developed a draft solicitation for industry comment. Additionally, a technical resource library was established on the web page to provide information to those interested in the procurement.

On October 7, 2014, the KSC Procurement Officer appointed the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) for the purpose of evaluating proposals received in response to the solicitation. The KEMCON RFP was issued October 10, 2014. The KEMCON RFP sought proposals from small businesses and anticipated award of a Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) contract with an Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) component

consisting of Cost Plus Fixed Fee. The contract period of performance consists of a two-year base period, one 2-year option and one 1-year option for a total of five potential years. During the course of the procurement, the Contracting Officer issued a total of seven RFP amendments to incorporate minor changes; three documents answering RFP questions were also posted.

In response to the KEMCON RFP, five timely proposals were received on or before the due date of January 6, 2015 from the following companies:

Integrated Mission Support Services (IMSS), LLC

Great Southern Engineering, Inc. (GSE)

Chenega Support Services, LLC (Chenega)

Straughan Environmental, Inc. (Straughan)

VZT Technologies, LLC (VZT)

EVALUATION PROCESS

The RFP prescribed three evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost, which were evaluated using the applicable procedures, adjectival ratings, levels of confidence, definitions, and/or percentile ranges specified in the RFP, FAR subpart 15.3, and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." The RFP advised offerors of the relative order of importance of these factors stating:

Relative Order of Importance of Evaluation Factors. All evaluation factors other than Cost, when combined, are approximately equal to Cost. Cost is more important than Mission Suitability, which is more important than Past Performance.

The RFP further identified two subfactors, which were to be weighted and considered in evaluating Mission Suitability as follows:

Management Approach, Key Personnel and Safety and Health	500 points
<u>Technical Approach</u>	<u>500 points</u>
Total Mission Suitability	1000 points

Under the procedures established in the RFP and the applicable acquisition regulations, the SEB was to evaluate Mission Suitability proposals under each subfactor to identify significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies. As a result of these findings, the SEB assigned an adjectival rating and percentile ranking/point score for each subfactor, and a total point score for Mission Suitability using the adjectival rating, definitions and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A).

For Past Performance, the RFP advised offerors that recent and relevant performance of work

similar in size, content, and complexity to the KEMCON requirements would be evaluated. The RFP further provided that the past performance of each offerors' subcontractors proposed to perform \$10M or more of total KEMCON work would be evaluated. Past performance was to be evaluated using the following levels of confidence as they are defined in the NFS 1815.305(a)(2): Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, or Neutral.

Finally, for the Cost factor, the RFP advised offerors that the Government would perform both a cost analysis and a cost realism analysis to determine whether proposed costs are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the KEMCON requirements, and are consistent with the offeror's proposed approach.

INITIAL EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS, COMPETITIVE RANGE DETERMINATION, & DISCUSSIONS

The SEB conducted the initial evaluation of the five proposals received in response to the RFP. The resulting mission suitability rating, past performance rating and cost evaluation of each offeror's proposal provided the basis for making a competitive range determination.

In accordance with FAR 52.215-1, the Contracting Officer determined that discussions were necessary and in the Government's best interest. Pursuant to FAR 15.306(c)(1), the Contracting Officer, with my concurrence, determined that the IMSS proposal was within the competitive range. Straughan, VZT, GSE, and Chenega's proposals were not found to be among the most highly rated and were therefore not included in the competitive range. The other offerors were notified of their exclusion from the competitive range on May 27, 2015.

Written and oral discussions were conducted with IMSS during the period of June 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015. The discussions focused on weaknesses and uncertainties requiring clarification that the SEB identified during the initial evaluation of IMSS's proposal. Upon the conclusion of discussions, a Final Proposal Revision (FPR) was requested from IMSS. A fully compliant FPR was timely received prior to the July 7, 2015 due date, including an executed proposed model contract. Following the same procedure as before, the SEB then completed a final evaluation of IMSS' FPR and reported its findings to the SSA as discussed below.

FPR MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATION

The evaluation of the FPR resulted in an increased Mission Suitability score for IMSS. No significant weaknesses, weaknesses, or uncertainties requiring clarification were found to remain in IMSS' Mission Suitability proposal. The SEB's report to the SSA focused on IMSS' corrections of weaknesses and its introduction of a strength within the Technical Approach.

Under the Management Approach subfactor, the SEB found a significant strength and no weaknesses or significant weaknesses. The significant strength was for the proposed key personnel that demonstrated highly relevant qualifications and experience for the proposed key positions.

Under this subfactor, IMSS received a rating of "Very Good."

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, the SEB found a strength for IMSS' technical proposal providing a thorough approach to the management and analysis of samples and quality assurance in PWS 3.0, Environmental Health Services. IMSS' technical proposal provides a well thought out description of the oversight, roles and responsibilities, and staffing detail required to implement PWS 3.0, which demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the requirement and effective oversight that assures the reliability of laboratory data.

Under this subfactor, IMSS received a rating of "Good."

IMSS' received an overall Mission Suitability score of 790 out of 1,000.

FPR PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

IMSS' past performance remained very highly pertinent to this acquisition and their performance on cited contracts was assessed as exceeded. IMSS demonstrated significantly relevant experience for the cited contracts in PWS 1.0, Project/Program Management, PWS 2.0, Medical Services, PWS 3.0, Environmental Health Services, and PWS 4.0, Environmental Services. Finally, IMSS has maintained safe and healthy operations for all cited contracts with the exception of one lost time case in 2010.

IMSS' Relevant Experience and Past Performance level of confidence remained "Very High."

COST EVALUATION

In accordance with FAR 15.404, the Government performed a cost analysis and a cost realism analysis to evaluate the realism and reasonableness of the proposed costs. SEB identified no probable cost adjustments. Based on these analyses, IMSS' proposed costs of \$87.8M was determined to be fair and reasonable.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

During the presentation, I questioned the SEB on the material presented and carefully considered the detailed findings presented by the SEB. I concluded that the SEB's evaluation was comprehensive, thorough, and well-documented. In addition, I solicited and considered the views of key senior personnel at KSC. These key senior personnel have responsibility related to this procurement and understood the application of the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

In determining the best value to the Government, I referred to the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors, as stated above. My selection was based on an assessment of IMSS' proposal as captured by the SEB findings against each of the evaluation factors. At the conclusion of the presentation, and upon careful deliberation taking the SEB's evaluation into account, I concluded that IMSS' proposal represents the best value to the Government.

In coming to this conclusion, I considered IMSS' proposed/probable costs. IMSS' final proposed costs remained fair, reasonable, and lower than the government estimate.

In considering how the overall proposal represents the best value to the government, I further considered the SEB's mission suitability findings for IMSS, which included a significant strength and a strength. IMSS received a significant strength in the Management Approach subfactor for three of its proposed key personnel. These key personnel, who will head up IMSS' management team, demonstrated highly relevant qualifications and experience for the proposed key positions. I agree with the SEB's finding that the team will bring their highly relevant leadership experience to bare on the performance of the diverse KEMCON work requirements and thereby greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance of KEMCON.

I further considered the SEB's finding of a Technical Approach subfactor strength for IMSS' approach to management and analysis of samples and quality in PWS 3.0. I agreed with the SEB's finding that IMSS' clear approach to accomplishing this requirement demonstrates its in-depth technical understanding of the requirement, which will have a positive impact on the successful performance of KEMCON.

Finally, I examined and agreed with the SEB's evaluation of IMSS' past performance. I noted that the SEB found IMSS' proffered past performance to be very highly pertinent to this acquisition and to have exceeded expectations on those contracts. IMSS' performance on MESC is significantly relevant to the magnitude of KEMCON and it exceeded performance expectations on all its proffered past performance. As such, I agree with the SEB's "Very High" level of confidence rating.

Considering the three evaluation factors and their relative importance, I find that IMSS' proposal represents the best value to the Government. Accordingly, I select Integrated Mission Support Services (IMSS), LLC for award of the Kennedy Environmental and Medical Contract.

// Original Signed //

9/21/2015

Robert D. Cabana

Date

Director

John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA
Source Selection Authority